UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,924	02/06/2004	Arthur Reginald Greef	M61.12-0574	8474

27366   7590   08/28/2009
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
SHAAWAT, MUSSA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/773,924	GREEF ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		MUSSA SHAAWAT	3627	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *6/8/2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *5-19 and 24-28* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *26-28* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *5-19,24 and 25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/8/2009*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to amendment filed on 06/08/2009. Claims 1-4 and

20-23 have been cancelled. Claims 5-19 and 24 have been amended. Claims 25-28

are newly added. Claims 5-19, 24 and 25-28 are pending examination.

Election by Original Presentation

2.   Newly added claims 26-28 are directed to an invention that is independent or

distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 5-19 and

24-25 (Group I) are drawn to a method and system comprising: defining an action

sequence for the plurality of documents, the action se quence defining actions that are

performed on each of the documents and a sequential order of the actions, wherein the

first computer can perform a first set of actions and the second computer can perform a

second set of actions, whereas claims 26-28 (Group II) are drawn to a method

comprising; defining how the plurality of documents are related in a collaboration

definition; defining how the purality of documents are integrated with various

applications in an application integration profile; including the business document

definition, the collaboration definition, and the application integration profile in a process

template. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally

presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original

presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 26-28 are withdrawn

from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b)

and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 5-19 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Meltzer et al., US Patent No. (6,125,391) referred to hereinafter as

Meltzer.

        As per claim 5, Meltzer teaches a computer implemented method of

communicating between a first computer and a second computer, comprising:

identifying a plurality of documents associated with a transaction; the first computer

creating one of the plurality of documents based on the action sequence (see at least

col. 3 lines 19-45 and col. 11 lines 1-25 and col. 12 lines 1-25), based on a relationship

between the first computer and the second computer, wherein the relationship between

the first computer and the second computer comprises the first computer having a

process template and the second computer having a copy of the process template (see

at least col. 20 and col. 8, col. 11 lines 1-10); and the first computer sending the one of

the plurality of documents to the second computer; and wherein the one of the plurality

of documents is validated against the process template before it is sent to the second

computer (see at least col. 84 lines 35-65). Meltzer does not expressly teach defining

an action sequence for the plurality of documents the action sequence defining actions

that are performed on each of the documents and a sequential order of the actions,

wherein the first computer can perform a first set of actions and the second computer cn perform a second set of actions. However It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of Meltzer to include defining actions that are performed on the documents and a sequential order of the actions, wherein the first computer can perform a first set of actions and the second computer can perform a second set of actions; since Meltzeir already teaches business interface definition that allows a customer to place an order by submitting a purchase order, which is in compliant with a document definition published in the business interface definition, in addition Meltzer teaches a document parser, at the document parser step the document is translated to the form of the host, for example XML to Java then the formatted events are passed to the router ... finally, the document is sent to a participant node (see at least col. 83 lines 30-45), in order to allow communication of documents flow between trading partner in an efficient manner.

As per claim 6 Meltzer teaches a method of claim 5 and further comprising: checking a version identifier to see if the first computer and second computer include the same version of a process template related to the action sequence (see at least col. 84 lines 35-65 col.29 lines 25-55); the second computer requesting a copy of the first computer's process template if the second computer does not include the same version of the process template as the first computer; the first computer sending the copy of the first computer's process template to the second computer; and the second computer retaining the copy of the first computer's process template (see at least col. 84 lines 35-65, col.2 lines 40-55).

As per claim 7, Meltzer the second computer sending a second one of the plurality of documents to the first computer, wherein the second one of the plurality of documents is validated against the opy of the first computer's process template before it is sent to the first computer (see at least col. 84 lines 35-65). Meltzer also teaches a business interface definition (BID) that tells potential trading partners the service the company offers and the document to use when communicating with such service, in addition the BID allows customer to place an order submitting a PO compliant with a document definition published in BID and the BID allows the supplier to check availability by downloading an inventory status report compliant with document definition published in the BID of a business system managing inventory (see at least col. 2 lines 40-55), in addition Meltzer teaches an XML parser that parses the received XML document according to the document type definition which matches it, if an error is found then the parser sends the document back (i.e. requesting a copy of the process template), the Business interface definition acts as a compiler (see at least Col. 84 lines 35-65).

As per claim 8, Meltzer teaches a method of claim 5 and further comprising: rendering a document based on a set of rendering rules for each of the documents (col. 23 lines 55-60, col. 81 lines 35-40), wherein the rendering comprises making the document viewable to a user and wherein the rendering rules define how each of the documents is rendered in various applications (col. 23 lines 55-60, col. 81 lines 35-40), the various applications including an electronic mail program and a spreadsheet program (see at least col. 84 lines 1-15).

As per claim 9, Mletzer teaches wherein validating the one of the plurality of documents against the process template comprises validating information entered into the one of the plurality of documents against the process template, and wherein validating the second one of the plurality of documents against the copy of the first computer's process template comprises validating information entered into the second one of the plurality of documents against the copy of the first computer's process template (see at least col. 84 lines 35-65).

As per claim 10, Meltzer teaches wherein the first computer validates the information entered into the one of the plurality of documents and the second computer validates the information entered into the second one of the plurality of documents (see at least col. 84 lines 35-65).

As per claim 11, Meltzer teaches a method of claim 10 wherein the first computer is associated with a supplier and the second computer is associated with a customer (see at least col.2 lines 45-55); and wherein the first computer is a process template publisher and the second computer is a process template subscriber and wherein the first computer propagates process templates to the second computer (see at least col. 25 lines 57-67, col.81 line 65-col.82 line 25).

As per claim 12, Meltzer teaches wherein validating the one of the plurality of documents against the process template comprises validating information entered into the one of the plurality of documents against the process template, and wherein validating the second one of the plurality of documents against the copy of the first computer's process template comprises validating information entered into the second

one of the plurality of documents against the copy of the first computer's process template (see at least col. 84 lines 35-65).

As per claim 13, Meltzer teaches a method of claim 5 and further comprising: integrating information in each of the documents into an application on one of the first computer and the second computer (see at least col. 8 lines 12-25); wherein the first computer is associated with a supplier in a customer/supplier relationship and the action on the first one of the plurality of documents is originating and wherein the second computer is associated with a customer in the customer/supplier relationship and the action on the second one of the plurality of documents is acknowledging (see at least Abstract, col. 2 lines 30-67, col. 83 lines 30-65).

As Per claims 14-19 and 24-25, the limitations of claims 14-19 and 24-25 are similar to the limitations of claims 5-13; therefore they are rejected based on the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants appears to argue that the amendments to the claims are not disclosed by or obvious in view of Meltzer.   In response to applicant argument's, the examiner respectfully disagrees; applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation.   Meltzer provides a solution for interfacing and making available different documents that trading partners require to process there business electronically, Meltzer states "Companies implementing one framework will have an application programming interface API which is different than the API's supporting other

frameworks. Thus, it is very difficult for companies to access each others business services, without requiring adoption of common business system interfaces. The development of such business system interfaces at the API level requires significant cooperation amongst the parties which is often impractical. Accordingly, it is desirable to provide a framework which facilitates interaction amongst diverse platforms in a communication network. Such system should facilitate spontaneous commerce between trading partners without custom integration or prior agreement on industry wide standards. Further, such systems should encourage incremental path to business automation, to eliminate much of the time, cost and risks of traditional systems integration." In addition Meltzer teaches A market making node in a network routes machine readable documents to connect businesses with customers, suppliers and trading partners. The self defining electronic documents, such as XML based documents, can be easily understood amongst the partners. Definitions of these electronic business documents, called business interface definitions, are posted on the Internet, or otherwise communicated to members of the network. The business interface definitions tell potential trading partners the services the company offers and the documents to use when communicating with such services. Thus, a typical business interface definition allows a customer to place an order by submitting a purchase order or a supplier checks availability by downloading an inventory status report. Also, the registration at a market maker node of a specification of the input and output documents, coupled with interpretation information in a common business library, enables participants in a trading partner network to execute the transaction in a way

which closely parallels the way in which paper based businesses operate. The present invention is covered by Meltzer, therefore Meltzer still meets the scope of the limitations as currently claimed.

Conclusion

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUSSA SHAAWAT whose telephone number is (571)272-2945. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-2945. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mussa A Shaawat/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
August 20, 2009

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627